DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 985 RC 014 431

AUTHOR Larson, Olaf F.; And Others
TITLE Partnership for Rural Improvement: External Review. February 23-March 5, 1980.
INSTITUTION Partnership for Rural Improvement, Pullman, Wash.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 45p.; For related documents, see ED 142 358, ED 162 787, ED 209 036, ED 214 729, ED 219 197 and RC 014 429-430.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; *Community Involvement; Community Services; Coordination; Delivery Systems; Diffusion (Communication); Extension Education; Higher Education; *Linking Agents; *Models; Organizational Development; *Program Evaluation; Rural Areas; *Rural Development
IDENTIFIERS *Partnership for Rural Improvement; Rural Development Act 1972; Washington

ABSTRACT

According to the second external review of the Partnership for Rural Improvement (PRI), the program demonstrated very good achievement of two of its major objectives: increasing collaboration among agencies and institutions and increasing competency of educational institutions to support rural development and planning. Between February 23 and March 5, 1983, a 3-person external review team visited regional and sub-regional offices and interviewed over 85 administrators, faculty, committee members, staff, and participants in the program. The team found that PRI was exhibiting increased strength, visibility, and awareness of factors which make for success in rural community service and development. They found that the essence of the PRI model was the initiation, maintenance, and strengthening of links between resource providers and users on a continuing organized basis. Although similar in some ways to other Title V programs, the model was unique because it created ongoing organizational entities composed of agencies and institutions as partners, it did not emphasize Cooperative Extension resources, and it involved local advisory groups in its project planning. Among other things, the review team suggested that PRI cultivate the full cooperation of all partners, use existing resources, improve PRI-Cooperative Extension relationships, and expand the Regional Coordinating Committee. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

1-21-83
rec'd

ED235985

PARTNERSHIP FOR RURAL IMPROVEMENT
EXTERNAL REVIEW

February 23 - March 5, 1980

A report prepared by:

Olaf F. Larson
J. Patrick Madden
Edward O. Moe, Chairman

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
WILLIAM H. GRAY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC014431

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	CHANGES OBSERVED 1979 TO 1980	5
III.	THE EMERGING PRI MODEL	14
IV.	COMPARISON OF THE PRI MODEL WITH TITLE V OF THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1972	17
V.	"EXPORTABILITY" OF THE PRI MODEL	19
VI.	ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INITIAL PRI OBJECTIVES	22
VII.	SUGGESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION	27
VIII.	CONCLUDING REMARKS	32
APPENDIX		
A.	PERSONS INTERVIEWED	A-1
B.	DETAILED SCHEDULE FOR REVIEW	B-1

PARTNERSHIP FOR RURAL IMPROVEMENT
EXTERNAL REVIEW

February 23 - March 5, 1980

I. INTRODUCTION

The design for a series of PRI evaluation activities included a two-phase external review. The first phase of the external review was conducted February 12-16, 1979, a little past the mid-point of the four-year program. The formal report which was submitted to PRI attempted to be future-oriented so that the conclusions reached and recommendations offered would be useful to the staff, institutional administrators, and the partners in the regional and sub-area coordinating committees involved in PRI as a continuing stream of activities.

The present report is based on the second phase of the external review conducted one year later by the same review team, namely:

Dr. Olaf F. Larson - Professor of Rural Sociology Emeritus, Cornell University; former Head of the Department of Rural Sociology, Cornell University; and former Director of the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development.

Dr. J. Patrick Madden - Professor of Agricultural Economics, Pennsylvania State University; and Director of the 1977 National Evaluation of Title V Programs under the Rural Development Act of 1972.

Dr. Edward O. Moe served as Chairman of the panel. Dr. Moe is Principal Sociologist and Coordinator of Rural Development Programs in the Science and Education Administration/Cooperative Research, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Objectives of the External Review

The purpose of the second phase external review was:

1. to help identify and interpret the impact of PRI on (a) communities and organizations, (b) development processes, (c) degrees of collaboration, and (d) involvement of partner institutions;

2. to assess the status of PRI in developing a broadly useful rural development model;

3. to examine the viability and effectiveness of the PRI model in contrast to other approaches to rural planning and development.

The PRI staff, with suggestions from the external review team, developed the following set of questions as the focus of the 1980 review:

A) Have the objectives of the proposal as written in 1975 been met?

B) What major changes have occurred since the first external review in 1979? Have changes been made to improve the overall model?

C) Has a viable model for rural/nonmetropolitan development emerged as a part of the PRI effort?

1) What is the model? What are its discriminating characteristics? What are its major strengths? What are its major weaknesses?

2) How does the model utilize the present capacity of partner institutions?

3) How does the model enhance and build new capacity within the partnership and within partner institutions?

4) How open is the partnership to entry of new members? Does it continue to expand and evolve as its programs are implemented?

D) How does PRI compare and/or contrast with other major rural improvement/ rural development models?

1) Specific comparisons will be made with selected Title V, Rural Development Act of 1972, programs and the overall Title V model.

2) Assessments will be made, where appropriate, as to the effectiveness of PRI in attaining desired outcomes efficiently, in terms of funding and staff inputs, as compared with results obtained.

E) Exportability of the PRI model. To what extent can the PRI model, in whole or in part, be introduced to other regions or other states? How can it involve additional institutions? Can it be applicable to international development efforts?

F) Can recommendations be offered which will substantially improve the design and operation of the model?

The review team added the following questions to guide its observations:

(As a part of question C above) How does PRI assess needs, identify opportunities, and determine priorities? How does PRI initiate new organizational and project activities in response to needs and priorities? Does PRI perform a unique role in creating and sustaining interorganizational linkages used in estimating needs and priorities and in initiating projects? Does or could PRI operate to develop a research agenda to link rural community information

needs with the research community?

The review team did not attempt to deal with question D2 above. The question is an important one, however, and deserves attention in the future.

Assumptions

The review team assumed that the PRI staff has the responsibility for the systematic collection and analysis of detailed data on the various projects within the program in relation to PRI's objectives, whereas the review team would be concerned with reviewing the organizational and process components of PRI and with identifying and interpreting major changes and issues. The external review team assumed that, in regard to specific project outcomes, it was important that the evaluations and observations of the PRI staff be taken into account together with the observations of the partners and a wide variety of program participants.

Procedures Followed

During five days, February 25-29, 1980, all members of the external review team visited each of the three sub-regions and talked with more than 85 persons concerning PRI. Interviews and discussions were held with the administrators of each collaborating educational institution, with participating and other faculty, with members of the three sub-regional committees, with members of the regional coordinating committee, with a broad range of program participants from rural communities and local and county agencies, and with the PRI staff. Generally all three members of the team participated in the discussions with administrators, with coordinating committee members, and the PRI staff. Usually only one or two were involved in the meetings with individual local program participants; this increased the number of individuals who could be contacted in a limited amount of time. Before the visits to the sub-regions there were orientation and planning sessions on February 23 and 24 with the PRI

staff. After the visits, two members of the team stayed on through March 5 to work on the report, for some further interviews with participating faculty at WSU and with PRI staff, and to observe and participate in the PRI Forum.

The list and identification of persons interviewed is attached as Appendix A. The detailed schedule followed, attached as Appendix B, reflects minor adjustments, made at the suggestion of the team members, in the initial itinerary developed by the PRI staff.

The procedures followed in the second review differed from those used in the first phase in the following ways:

1) All three members of the review team visited all three sub-regions rather than, as in 1979, having only one member go to each sub-region. This procedure was suggested by the team, on the basis of its first-phase experience, so as to provide a cross-check on perceptions. The team felt that this approach also reduced the possibility of failing to bring out information useful for the purposes of the review.

2) The sub-regions were visited before the visit to WSU and the discussions with the PRI staff at WSU.

3) Transportation to the sub-regions was in the company of the PRI Program Administrator. Thus, during the travel between sites there was opportunity for an orientation to the sub-region situation by the person most acquainted with the details of the PRI program from its inception.

4) More time was built into the schedule for discussions with the PRI staff at WSU.

5) A determined effort was made to provide an opportunity to hear anyone who might have felt left out of the first phase review.

6) An opportunity was provided to observe and participate in the PRI Forum.

7) Within the sub-regions relatively less attention was given in this second phase to the details of project activity and more was given to understanding

the structure, the processes, the roles, the commitments, and the nature of the obstacles to instituting and transferring a PRI-type model.

Documents available to the team since the first phase of the review include the 1978-79 Annual Report to the Kellogg Foundation and the November 1979 draft proposal to the Foundation for a four-year renewal grant. Materials provided the team during the visits included written statements on project activity in the Eastern and in the Western Sub-regions, the 1979-80 PRI Plan of Work for the Western Sub-region, a statement on the new Community Service Center at Eastern Washington University which includes a description of recent PRI activities at EWU, and a copy of the November 1979 draft of Gregory Spencer's paper "Linking Knowledge and Action: PRI's Community Consultant."

The interviews and discussions, supplemented by the written materials, provide the basis for the judgements of the external review team about PRI.

The team members appreciate deeply the cooperation, the assistance, and the hospitality on the part of the administrators, faculty, and staff of collaborating institutions, the PRI staff, and PRI program participants.

Nature of This Report

The primary audience for which this report was prepared consists of those already involved in and with responsibilities for PRI, namely the PRI staff, members of the regional coordinating and sub-regional committees, and administrators in the collaborating educational institutions. With this audience in mind it has seemed unnecessary to go into details with respect to PRI project activity.

II. CHANGES OBSERVED 1979 TO 1980

General Overview of the Status of the Partnership

Overall the review team sees the Partnership as having demonstrated continued and increased strength, increased visibility, and increased awareness

of the factors which make for success in rural community service and development activities. These general conclusions are supported by:

--the clear evidence of high interest and strong commitment by the collaborating educational institutions for a continuing PRI program;

--the perception that the partners have a sense of ownership in PRI, a stake in its outcomes, and a feeling of responsibility to help make it succeed;

--the credibility which PRI has generally received in its activities to assist local communities to meet their needs;

--an increased number and diversity of users of PRI;

--the "spin-offs" within the partner educational institutions directly or indirectly attributed to PRI and the diffusion of the PRI idea beyond the partnership;

--the instances of increased insight related by PRI staff and coordinating committee members as a result of their own analysis of PRI and their experiences with it; an example is the "neutral square" concept of PRI, formulated by a sub-regional committee member.

Within the sub-regions, several encouraging trends are apparent. There has been a strong positive turn-around in PRI operations and achievements in the Western sub-region as compared with a year ago. In the Central sub-region two alternative views of the future were projected a year ago. One was that PRI had made the transition related to a change in the program associate position and substantial strides forward would be made in the following months. The other view was that the PRI program was in trouble unless some staffing changes were made. With special help by skilled staff from the central PRI staff, the program in the Central sub-region has recently started the process of regrouping. The Eastern sub-region continues at the high level of achievement evidenced a year ago.

Changes in the PRI Structure

The Regional Coordinating Committee

The RCC initiated an effort to identify problems of region-wide concern. First priority was given to Railroad Abandonment. A task force directly accountable to the RCC was established to work on this problem. The task force represents an innovation within PRI. In this case more than 40 interested individuals from within the region have been involved. Of these, about 18 have constituted a "core" group. PRI provided task force coordination through PRI Program Associate C. Gordon Morris and research support through PRI Research Associate Robert H. McDaniel. A draft of the report "Social Impact Assessment and Railroad Abandonment: Three Case Studies in Rural Eastern Washington," prepared by the Citizens' Task Force on Railroad Abandonment was made public at the March 5-6 Forum.

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory no longer holds membership on the Regional Coordinating Committee, its contractual period with PRI having come to an end as initially scheduled.

The Sub-Regional Coordinating Committees

The size and composition of the sub-regional committees continues to vary among the sub-regions aside from the fact that each includes representation from the area's community college, the educational services district, and from Cooperative Extension. There have been some changes in committee membership during the year as a result of a) adding new partners, b) different individuals representing continuing partners, and c) in one sub-region, dropping out because the project of special interest to certain members was completed. The net effect of these additions and changes appears to be to increase the geographical representation of rural areas in both the Eastern and the Western sub-regions and to slightly broaden the types of agency or local government interests represented.

Role of the Program Associate in the Sub-regions

The importance of the program associate role within each sub-region for the successful functioning of PRI has been further reinforced during the past year. The functions of the program associate and the characteristics and conditions essential for effective functioning are becoming more clearly understood.

Role of the Supporting PRI Staff - WSU and EWU

At EWU the program associate who had been responsible for PRI administrative and program leadership, from the start of the collaborative relationship with WSU, asked to be relieved; the duties were assumed by another faculty member, from the Department of Education, who had previously been actively involved with PRI.

Because of the special situation which developed in the Central sub-region, associated with a change in the sub-region program associate position, two of the PRI staff from WSU have recently worked extensively in the sub-region to assist in revitalizing the PRI program there pending the employment of a new program associate.

As noted previously, a PRI program associate at WSU was the coordinator for the Citizens' Task Force on Railroad Abandonment established by the Regional Coordinating Committee and a PRI research associate was assigned to provide research support for the task force.

Funding Changes

The collaborating educational institutions have increased their direct monetary contributions this year to fund PRI. This amounts to about $41,000 of new money at WSU, $25,000 at EWU, $3,000 at Wenatchee Valley College toward the salary of the program assistant, and $1,500 at Washington State Community College District 17 for operational support.

In addition, as a result of proposals which PRI assisted in varying degrees in developing, grant and contract funds have been or are being made available. Examples include: a planning grant from HUD for the Almira community, a grant from the Washington Council for the Humanities to the Kalispel tribal council for a video-film on the history of the Kalispel people, a $42,000 contract to Wenatchee Valley College from the Council on Post-Secondary Education for the development and testing of a displaced homemaker's program, an award to Washington State Community College District 17's Women's Programs to establish a Displaced Homemaker Multi-Service Center, and an $85,000 planning grant from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration for Washington State University and Wenatchee Valley College relative to public radio and television services for central Washington.

Changes within Collaborating Universities and Colleges

Within the last year a number of changes pertaining to what is referred to by terms such as "community service," "public service," and "continuing education" have been initiated, or strengthened, or are in the planning stage at the collaborating universities and colleges. Administrators and faculty most immediately involved attribute certain of these changes directly or indirectly to the PRI experience. All of the changes have important implications for a continuing PRI program. These changes include:

--the newly established Community Service Center at Eastern Washington University with an advisory committee drawn from across the university and with representation from each of the PRI sub-regions;

--the new Regional Center for Continuing Education at Eastern Washington University;

--the new Community Resource Center at Wenatchee Valley College which

is working closely with PRI;

--the appointment and work at Washington State University of the Task Force on Continuing Education, chaired by Richard A. Hagood, PRI Program Administrator;

--the establishment at WSU of a graduate level training program in the College of Education which leads to state certification for community education administration;

--the new graduate training program in social and community problem solving at WSU which is centered in the Department of Sociology and funded by a substantial grant from the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The review team was made aware of the "opening up" of college facilities which has been taking place at Big Bend Community College and of the arrangement there to have all staff on a four-day class week so that time is free for other professional responsibilities such as specialized weekend workshops and activities in the small communities within the college district.

Attention was again directed this year to the emerging Cooperative Graduate Planning Program between EWU and WSU which offers Master's level training to prepare professional planners for rural and smaller urban communities.

The review team noted the attention being given to the rewards issue for community service (as compared with teaching and traditional research) by faculty at WSU and EWU.

Projects - Their Development and Outcomes

From the review team's sampling of project activities represented by program participants interviewed, from the written materials provided, and from the discussions with partners and PRI staff, we conclude that there is continued evidence of tangible project outcomes. Only a few examples are

cited here, namely: the video-film "People of the Pend Oreille: The Kalispels" produced by the Kalispel historical project; the establishment of a rural library district in Pend Oreille County; the growth impact analysis in Ferry County; the 56 nours of training given to 24 displaced homemakers in the Colville area; the economic impact analysis of the Omak Stampede; the establishment of a Women's Resource Center at Wenatchee; and the training in Budgeting, Accounting, and Review (BARS) for municipal and county officials. Reference has already been made to the forthcoming report prepared by the Citizens' Task Force on Railroad Abandonment, a spin-off of which is the presence of a group of citizens dispersed through the region who are informed on the railroad abandonment issue.

The review team sees evidence of a broadening in the range of issues (needs) represented and in the set of users and providers involved in the projects underway or being actively considered, e.g. a start on problems of region-wide concern, the water problems of the Malott community, the assessment of community health care needs (Central Washington Hospital), the displaced homemakers programs, and group process training for farm organization members.

It appears that there has been relatively greater emphasis on the assessment of local community needs through various techniques, with the result that not only are needs identified but that what is <u>not</u> a need is determined (as in the case of a day care facility for the residents of Entiat). In one sub-region procedures adopted by the sub-regional committee have greatly increased the freedom and flexibility of the program associate to take the initiative in responding to requests for PRI assistance.

Other Changes

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

A year ago the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory was in the planned withdrawal phase of its contractual arrangement to provide specified services to PRI. This withdrawal has been completed. The consultant services provided a helpful resource in training and gave access to national levels of competence in theory and awareness of new developments relevant to PRI. A question may be raised as to the means or the resources which will now be available to provide comparable assistance to PRI.

Educational Materials

Educational materials produced or on which substantial progress was made included, among others; the BARS videotape for training of municipal and county officials in Budgeting, Accounting, and Review prepared with the cooperation of the Washington State Auditor's Office; the three-volume handbook on growth impact assessment and growth management prepared at EWU for use in rural communities; preparation, through the Task Force on Continuing Education, at WSU of a comprehensive directory of resources and services to the public available on campus; the previously mentioned task force report on Railroad Abandonment; and videotapes produced within the sub-regions such as the one on the Grand Coulee community presented at the 1980 Forum.

Analysis of the PRI Model

Substantial progress has been made during the last year in analyzing two important components of the PRI model as it has been developing. One is represented by Gregory Spencer's paper on the staff position in the sub-region which has been designated as the Program Associate but which in Spencer's paper is referred to as Community Consultant. The second is

represented by the basic analysis being made by Ralph Loomis and Gregory Spencer, some of which was presented at the 1980 Forum, of collaborative or interorganizational relationships. These types of analyses should contribute to increasing the effectiveness of PRI where it is now operating and, if PRI is exported, should facilitate its introduction into other areas without all the "costs" of relearning the lessons offered by the PRI experience to date.

The review team notes that in the grant renewal request to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation the term "community service consultant" (rather than program associate) was used to identify the role of the PRI staff member located in the sub-region. Likewise the term "university-based specialist in community service" (rather than program associate) was used to identify the faculty at Washington State University and Eastern Washington University who hold PRI staff appointments on a full-time or part-time basis.

Spin-Offs Attributed to PRI

A number of the changes already identified within the collaborating universities and colleges are in the nature of spin-offs attributed directly or indirectly to PRI. An additional set of spin-offs in the area of education was impressively enumerated by Dean George Brain, College of Education, WSU. Among these were: the concept for the creation of a new coalition, a Council of Deans and Directors of Education for the State of Washington, which includes the 16 private institutions in addition to the five public institutions; a coalition for faculty development including WSU and the University of Idaho; a consortium, also involving cooperation with Idaho, to generate technical-vocational educational materials for a career development program starting in the lower grades of schools; and the adaptation of the model in working with boards of education and Washington school districts coping

with problems of declining enrollment and excess school buildings.

Still another spin-off is the use made of the PRI experience in several parts of the forthcoming book Rural Society and Environment, co-authored by William R. Lassey, which presents a contemporary perspective on rural society in the United States.

III. THE EMERGING PRI MODEL

The ultimate goal of PRI is rural improvement, enhancing the quality of life of citizens in rural communities. This has also been the goal of a host of experimental and demonstration small community and rural development efforts initiated in the past or on-going in different parts of the United States. This has been the rationale in part or in whole for a wide range of national, regional, state, and more local agencies and programs, both public and private. Some of these agencies and some of these programs have been directed, in practice or in principle, to assisting rural communities with the types of problems for which PRI assistance has been given. Processes have been used by some of these agencies and some of these programs which, at least on the surface, appear to be similar to processes used by the PRI staff in working with people in rural communities. A question of crucial importance, therefore, is "what are the discriminating characteristics of the PRI model?" The review team has searched through the discussions, observations, and review of written material for an answer to this question.

Rural communities as a category identify a wide range of problems for which they would like solutions. Accumulated experience suggests that the complement of resources required for community problem-solving to bring about the desired changes includes:

Education (existing knowledge)
Research (new knowledge)
Technical Assistance (application of knowledge)

Leadership Development
Organizational Assistance
Funds (loans, grants, loan guarantees, etc.)

The required resources are located in a diverse set of agencies, organizations, and institutions--both public and private--from local to more inclusive levels.

There are countless instances in which a linkage has been developed by some means between a rural community and one or more of these resources, often with positive, tangible results. Experience suggests, however, that the linkage with the most appropriate agency is not necessarily readily apparent to the community and that although the problem may require several resources the linkages are developed on a less comprehensive basis. Experience suggests that a comprehensive collaborative approach of agencies has tended to be around an immediate problem of a crisis nature (e.g. a disaster).

PRI is a linkage model. Whatever else it does or has done it provides a linkage between resources for community problem-solving on the one hand and the users of those resources on the other hand. We see that the essence of the PRI model is the initiation, maintenance, and strengthening of these linkages between resource providers and users on a continuing, organized basis. This involves both structure and process. The structure affords a place of organizational neutrality, within which resource providers may consider the needs of users and the appropriate or feasible response. The process utilizes skills and competencies which, at this stage of the emerging model, require further clarification and specification but which include among others, skill in making clear the nature of the problem for which resources are requested and in facilitating collaboration among resource providers.

The model specifies that the land-grant institution and other institutions of higher education be included among the collaborating resource providers but that the collaborators not be limited to such institutions.

This linkage system to be kept "on line" requires the support of a staff person (designated as "program associate" or "community consultant") skilled in a number of functional roles, e.g. making entry into rural communities, diagnosing community problems or needs, communication, group process facilitation, identifying and accessing appropriate resources, etc. The effectiveness of this staff person depends in part upon also being identified as "neutral", i.e. as a staff person serving the collaborative linkage system as a whole rather than being identified as a staff representative of a single collaborating provider.

The structure and the process may also be directed at achieving such intermediate objectives as increasing the capacity of resource providers to respond to rural needs and opportunities. They may be directed at increasing the competency of local communities to assess needs, determine priorities, and improve decision-making. Important as these are and as much as they have been conducted by PRI, they are not the essence of the model.

If our analysis as to the discriminating characteristics of the emerging PRI model is approximately correct, then the question arises as to the alternatives available in the future for preserving such characteristics. Can this be done within any one of the existing educational institutions, e.g. Cooperative Extension, community colleges, or the educational service districts? Can it be done within a community action type agency? Can it be done jointly by Cooperative Extension and the community colleges? Or does it require a new institutional addition on a permanent basis?

Further attention must, of course, be given to the conditions under which the discriminating characteristics of the model may be maintained.

It appears that there are interactional effects from the collaborative efforts which yield outcomes in increasing competencies within local communities, in increasing the capacity of resource providers to respond, and in problem

solution which are beyond those which would be achieved without the PRI linkage model. As analysts and external reviewers we have a responsibility to give a reminder that it is necessary to search for possible alternative explanations for the favorable outcomes of PRI to date. For example, could the skills and competence of the PRI-supported staff have achieved the same results without a PRI structure?

IV. COMPARISON OF THE PRI MODEL WITH TITLE V OF THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1972

During the recent national evaluation of Title V of the Rural Development Act[1/], the Title V program in the state of Washington was recognized as one of the more exciting and promising experiments in developing an effective rural development strategy. At that time, PRI and Title V had been integrated into a single operating program. Many of the things being initiated by the Washington Title V-PRI program in 1976 and 1977 were similar to efforts being attempted in other states. However, several unique features of the PRI program are noted.

First, Title V programs in the various states are always located within the major land-grant institution, with funding provided directly to Cooperative Extension and to the Experiment Station. As lead institution, the land-grant university typically entered into bilateral contractual relationships with other educational institutions, providing a transfer of funds to pay for faculty released time and other services. Many different agencies (local, regional, state, and federal) were involved in various Title V projects throughout the nation, but almost always on an ad hoc project-by-project basis; no state except Washington created an on-going local organizational entity composed of agencies and institutions as partners and owners of the program. Title V programs in other states typically are composed of several projects requiring the provision

1/ Madden, J. Patrick. Rural Development and the Land Grant University. Washington, D.C.: The National Rural Center. 1977.

of extension and/or research expertise and assistance from the land-grant institution or cooperating colleges and universities in addressing local problems and opportunities. In many states, the Title V operation consisted of a functionally integrated research and extension effort, with highly effective cooperation between research and extension personnel in conducting the project activities. In other locations little or no cooperation between research and extension was manifested.

PRI has not emphasized the use of Cooperative Extension resources, though recently the CRD extension specialists (particularly Dwight Pace) have played an increasingly active role in providing group facilitation training to enhance local leadership and organizational capacity. Certain other CRD expertise has been provided by Ralph Loomis. Notably little involvement of research personnel in PRI projects has been evident to date. One major exception is the Railroad Abandonment Project initiated by the Regional Coordinating Committee and conducted under the leadership of Gordon Morris in conjunction with other researchers at WSU and CRD specialists, with substantial input from local citizens.

One important way in which PRI departs from the typical Title V program is in the extent to which local advisory groups are involved in initiating and conducting the various projects. PRI relies heavily on local agencies and citizens to identify problems and opportunities requiring project activity. The 1977 national evaluation of Title V determined that the majority of states responding (24 out of 40) indicated local advisory groups were "very useful" in identifying problems. However, only 18 states indicated local advisory groups were very useful in determining priorities; eleven states in approving projects; and nine states in actual implementation of the Title V program.[2/]

[2/] Madden, ibid, Table 4.1, p. 42.

Results from the 1977 evaluation of Title V showed that the various state Title V programs did include involvement with a wide range of agencies (local, state, regional, and national). However, this involvement was almost always ad hoc, in response to specific problems or opportunities--not on a continuing basis as is done by PRI.

Thus it appears that a significant contrast exists between the typical Title V programs and PRI in the fact that PRI seeks to create an effective partnership of local citizens, agencies, groups, and institutions, whereas Title V programs typically do not include this feature. Members of the Partnership are encouraged to develop and maintain a sense of ownership in the PRI activities and structure. Experience to date indicates that this feeling of ownership is successfully emerging and is being nurtured by PRI staff. One of the major benefits of this approach is that PRI seems much more likely than Title V to develop a political constituency of support, so essential to the long-term survival of the program.

V. "EXPORTABILITY" OF THE PRI MODEL

Three conditions must exist in a community or region before the PRI model could be successfully replicated:

1. The spark of initiative--the desire and will to achieve an improved community, and the belief that this is possible, on the part of one or more persons in the community or region.
2. Understanding--an understanding by these persons of the basic principles underlying a successful PRI operation.
3. Resources--acquisition or mobilization of the necessary resources.

Initiative

The initial condition, the spark of initiative, often does not exist in a rural community or region where "success stories" are nonexistent and persons of vision and hope are few and are lacking in credibility. Many of

the experiences of PRI during its first three years of operation could, if properly documented and presented through appropriate media, provide an impressive array of success stories which could serve to ignite the spark of initiative among those in the community or region who could become principals in a PRI-type program.

Understanding the PRI Model

The second condition, understanding of the PRI model, also requires careful documentation of the lessons learned through the PRI experience, which in turn requires a clear conceptualization of the PRI model.

PRI is a continually emerging reality, evolving as new problems and opportunities are encountered. Consequently the development of the PRI model is an iterative process. For example, viewed from the current perspective with the benefit of three and a half years experience, the original version of the PRI model as presented in the 1975 proposal to Kellogg Foundation seems over simplistic. But at the time it was written, the model inherent in the proposal reflected the 1975 state of the arts. Since that time, much has been experienced--mistakes have been made, obstacles have been overcome, sweet success and bitter failure have been tasted, and consequently the principles and causal laws underlying the operation of PRI have come to be understood much more clearly. Further iterations will be required, in the form of additional attempts to implement the model under a wider range of conditions and locations, before the PRI model can be fully explicated.

Even then, experience that is not well conceptualized and documented will fail to yield the basis for exportation of the PRI model. If future generations of rural community development practitioners and participating citizens are to benefit from the mistakes and the successes of PRI, these experiences must be thoroughly documented, in a form appropriate to the various audiences who must

understand the model--for example, written treatises for the academicians, video or slide tapes for local citizens and officials, etc.

Essential Resources

Availability of resources is the third necessary condition, the appropriate kinds and amounts of resources available in right timing. In addition to the six categories of essential resources listed earlier (Section III), the qualities of the PRI staff and persons performing other key roles have profound leverage in determining the success or failure of the program.

Experience gained through PRI and elsewhere has underlined the importance of careful selection and training of key personnel. The program associate, also called community consultant, is in the most pivotal position to influence the outcome of a PRI-type program. We applaud the decision by the PRI administrator to commission a paper to pull together the lessons learned to date from the PRI experience regarding the role of community consultant.[3/] Similar papers should be prepared for each of the crucial roles as identified in the explication of the PRI model. Included in the list of essential roles are chairperson of the subregional committee and the PRI administrator. For example, it is abundantly clear to the team of external reviewers that the success attained by PRI to date is due to no small part to the way in which Rich Hagood performed the role of PRI Administrator, in conjunction with many other persons who have provided essential assistance. Clearly his personal and professional attributes and the intensity of his efforts on behalf of PRI have played an essential role in the success of the program. It is equally clear that not just anyone picked off the street could cause the program to succeed. What is needed for successful replication or exportation of the PRI model is a clear and accurate conceptualization of the attitudinal,

---

[3/] Gregory P. Spencer, "Linking Knowledge and Action: PRI's Community Consultant," November, 1979.

behavioral, and professional attributes necessary for this role and other essential roles upon which the success of the PRI model depends, as well as the structural and process ingredients essential to success.

Experience with PRI has indicated the importance of keeping the geographic size of each functional unit (such as the PRI sub-region) small enough to avoid excessive travel burdens. Furthermore, the size and scope of any such program activity should be realistically constrained to match the available program resources--education, research, technical assistance, leadership development, organizational assistance, and funds--in relation to the needs and resources of the target area.

VI. ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INITIAL PRI OBJECTIVES

For the purposes of discussing achievements of the Partnership for Rural Improvement, the list of six objectives identified during last year's external review report will be followed. The program has done extremely well on the first two of these objectives, and successively less well on the other objectives.

1. Increasing the collaboration among agencies and institutions in achieving rural planning and development goals.

The sub-regional committees are generally exemplary in this regard, particularly as they are currently operating in the eastern and western sub-regions. They are doing a really good job of enhancing collaboration between and among agencies and institutions. The regional coordinating committee is also performing well. The task force created for the railroad abandonment study is an excellent example of collaborative effort, developing and strengthening linkages among various agencies and institutions. And finally, we observed a trend toward greater diversity of agencies and institutions involved and a growing cooperation by the personnel

representing those organizations during this past year. In short, we give PRI an "A+" with regard to this first objective.

2. Increasing the competency of educational institutions to support planning and development in rural areas.

Again, PRI deserves an "A+". For example, we have been impressed with the work that Joe Luther and others have been doing at Eastern Washington University in providing their graduate and undergraduate planning students with hands-on experience in going into rural communities and helping citizens and officials with the process of planning the future of their communities. As a result of this experience, the students end up with better training--they go back into the classroom with a richer experience. The faculty also benefit from their experience and from interaction with those students. So, we see a definite increase in the competence of those educational institutions for supporting the planning and developmental activities associated with rural areas. This is just one example--there are many others.

3. Increasing the ability of individuals in rural communities and the abilities of agencies to identify problems and to proceed with the achievement of planning and development goals.

Representatives of several agencies told us that they would in effect give very high marks to PRI for bringing process facilitation training, conflict-resolution skills, and other kinds of organizational capabilities into their groups and agencies. Sometimes, this is done by individual PRI staff or Cooperative Extension personnel, sometimes by teams; for example, Cooperative Extension has provided Dwight Pace; Eastern Washington University has provided Bill Goetter; the PRI staff has provided Vicki Braglio-Luther and Sally Bartrum. Several of the partners and users of PRI told the review team that PRI has definitely enhanced their capacity to organize effectively and to conduct useful meetings for the purpose of identifying community goals and taking meaningful action.

Another aspect of helping the communities and the agencies to identify problems is needs assessment. Several approaches and procedures for needs assessment have been offered to the local communities and groups. Different models have been tried with varying results. We applaud the effort by PRI to get needs assessment activities going--motivating and teaching citizen groups and committees to get feed-back from people as to their perceptions of needs and priorities. We have a suggestion in this regard, however: a more systematic and comprehensive approach needs to be taken. Studies by Don Dillman and others indicate there are important differences from one county to an adjacent county in regard to various social and economic indicators, such as unemployment, infant mortality, and availability of health services. Studies have also shown that there are wide differences within counties, from one rural community to another, in regard to various social indicators and citizen perceptions of needs and priorities. An overall regional or state-wide average priority or average needs assessment is needed for general program planning. Simultaneously, particularized needs assessments, sensitive to local conditions and problems, are essential to local action. This requires a great deal of citizen input, with continued technical assistance such as that being provided by PRI.

4. Improving linkages between the providers of knowledge and those persons and organizations in the rural areas who would use this knowledge for planning and development purposes.

We are impressed by the fact that Washington State University has developed a directory of its professional resources available for rural community planning and development. This directory indicates the various kinds of expertise that can be tapped within WSU. This directory is now in the hands of the editor, and should be published very soon.

A similar directory is being written for Eastern Washington University. This is a very good start. We suggest that, if feasible, directories should be expanded to encompass the other institutions and various public and private agencies that have resources helpful to rural communities.

We recognize, of course, that major obstacles remain even after the resources are identified. Arrangements must be created to make resources accessible to users. For example, if a person at an institution can help solve a problem in a rural community, obstacles must be overcome before that expertise can be effectively brought to bear in the solution of the problem. One of the persistent barriers is the rewards system within these institutions. Sometimes the individual faculty or staff members may perceive that it is not in their best self-interest to participate in the very kinds of activity needed and requested by rural communities.

5. Improving the quality and effectiveness of general education in rural areas.

As this objective was initially conceived, it referred to kindergarten through 12th grade. Early in the program this objective was ruled out-of-bounds for PRI, as being beyond the scope of available resources. We think that this was a wise and appropriate decision, which has permitted a concentration of resources into more feasible areas of program activity.

6. Integrating more effectively the instructional, research, and extension resources of the land-grant university to serve rural regions.

This objective is a major challenge--to effectively bring the tremendous expertise of the institutions of higher learning to bear in identifying and solving the problems of rural people in rural communities. The national evaluation of Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972 revealed the outstanding potential of the land-grant university system and various other institutions to help rural communities and rural people. Equally obvious was the gap between the potential and the actual accomplishments in most states. Hopefully some of the lessons being learned through

PRI will reveal ways to bridge that gap and increase the degree of attainment of that potential. Part of the challenge is to figure out ways of effectively integrating the various resources discussed in Section III--educational, research, technical assistance, leadership development, organizational assistance, and funds.

We see some very strong pluses in the PRI experience. Students have received practical experience. Classroom instruction has been enriched through guest PRI lecturers and through practical experience in PRI by teachers and students. We have been impressed by the amount of "applied research" being done by PRI. Herein lies a potential problem which needs to be resolved--what is "research" to one person may not be considered "research" to another person. This semantic problem has profound implications with regard to the reward system; a person may do what he considers in good faith to be important research. An yet when this person's performance is evaluated for promotion, tenure, pay increases and so forth, he may be disappointed because what he considers research is not considered research by some of his influential professional peers, including the reviewers of professional journals.

Some of the materials such as descriptive papers, planning manuals for counties, etc., are very practical, badly-needed materials. PRI is producing an impressive amount of this material. We view this as one essential kind of research.

Another essential kind of research is generation of new knowledge, including the estimation of the causal parameters needed to understand why certain efforts succeed better than others, and discovery of the underlying causal laws governing progress of various kinds. We see very little of this kind of research as compared with what could and should be done. We view this as one of the remaining challenges facing PRI. We suggest, for example, more research on estimation of needs and the potential in various areas, feasibility studies, analysis of trends in various social and economic conditions, estimation of causal parameters, and clarification of the trade-offs that must

be faced in planning and creating desired future conditions and opportunities in rural communities.

The review team found relatively little evidence of functional integration between research and extension; this is certainly not limited to the State of Washington. In the national Title V evaluation, many state programs exhibited very little if any effective functional integration. We are not entirely sure why this problem is so pervasive, but we simply wish to underline this as one of the remaining challenges.

VII. SUGGESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

In this section the review team offers some suggestion for consideration by the administrators, staff, and regional and sub-regional committees with responsibilities for the Partnership for Rural Improvement. These suggestions reflect problems and issues which came out of the frank statements of opinion and the perceptions expressed by the more than 95 persons interviewed, some of whom participated in two, three, or four of the scheduled sessions. The suggestions reflect a summary assessment of these problems and issues for a continuing PRI program.

1. Continued efforts are needed to cultivate and encourage the full cooperation of all the resource providers (partners) essential to meeting the six or so elements suggested as required for comprehensive community problem-solving. The statement was made that there has not been consistent involvement with state and federal agencies, in the linkage of these agencies with rural communities, and that these agencies have no sense of partnership. Analysis of the reasons for this situation with respect to the state and federal agencies, of the conditions under which they may be most effectively involved, and of the most appropriate relationship by such agencies to the regional and sub-regional committees would seem to be in order.

2. One special aspect of (1) above is the need for continued and increased attention to tapping the existing knowledge and the new knowledge (research) resources of the university, especially from the parts of the university not traditionally involved in community service. At the same time it is apparent that there are widely differing conceptions of what is involved in research and that some kinds of research elicit strongly negative feelings at the more local level. Likewise it is apparent that within the universities there are widely differing views as to what constitutes community service (public service, continuing education, extension, and cooperative extension).

3. Related to both (1) and (2) above is the need to encourage an understanding of the rewards systems operative within partner or potential partner institutions and the implications of the rewards arrangements for encouraging or discouraging participation of individuals or organizations in collaborative activities. There is a need to help partner representatives succeed through mutually beneficial activities, to give attention to giving credit in appropriate ways including developing and maintaining mechanisms to provide feedback on PRI outcomes to relevant agencies and institutions and to citizens. There is a need to recognize the potential system conflicts associated with rewards and to encourage partners to give attention to their internal reward arrangements for individuals in relation to collaborative efforts, community service, user-oriented research, etc. In general, there is a need to strive for equity and for responsiveness of the rewards systems within partner agencies and institutions.

4. A special aspect of (1) and (3) above pertains to the relationship between PRI and Cooperative Extension. It is clear that PRI has the full support of the top-level administration of the WSU College of Agriculture and of Cooperative Extension. County extension agents sit on the coordinating committee in each sub-region. The PRI project summaries, e.g. in

the 1978-79 Annual Report, in numerous instances identify involved individuals as Cooperative Extension staff members at the county or area level. Nevertheless, discussions with Cooperative Extension staff, with PRI staff, and with individuals having joint appointments yielded evidence that there are some strains in and some concerns about the PRI-Cooperative Extension relationship which merit attention. The reasons for these strains are complex and varied. They are said, in part, as noted in the review team's 1979 report, to derive from the low-key role intentionally played by Cooperative Extension in the sub-regions in the early stage of PRI. There are honest differences of opinion about whether PRI is or is not duplicating what Cooperative Extension has done or, given the equivalent resources, could do. There is a lack of understanding by some critics in Cooperative Extension of the discriminating characteristics of PRI as compared with Cooperative Extension. There are some differences of opinion about the capacity of Cooperative Extension to perform the "organizationally neutral" role which is a crucial element of the PRI model. There are differences in views as to the flexibility, the readiness of Ccoperative Extension, as compared with PRI, to respond to the wide range of rural community needs. Some extension agents at the county level interested in being involved in community development, in PRI activities, are said to feel they are taking a risk professionally if they do so (a) in some instances, because of the attitude of middle-level supervision, and (b) because of the low priority given by county government decision-makers, and the organized agricultural clientele to which these decision-makers listen, to community work as compared with the more traditional, agriculturally-oriented extension programs. Some extension staff members interviewed expressed the belief that Cooperative Extension contributions had not always been appropriately or adequately recognized by PRI. Fears were expressed that, in a period of tight tax dollars, PRI and Cooperative Extension would be seen as competitive

and as duplicating efforts, to the disadvantage of funding for Cooperative Extension. The assertion was heard that PRI had not made enough effort to involve relevant state-level extension staff, citing an instance when this staff was not invited to a PRI staff training seminar conducted by an out-of-state specialist.

The types of views summarized are not unlike those which might be heard in any large-scale organization when an innovation is introduced. Such organizations need continued and purposeful efforts to minimize the misunderstandings and to allay the fears of those who feel threatened.

5. Related to tapping the existing and new knowledge resources (2 above) is the issue of the readiness of faculty who are not experienced in community service, who do not traditionally do such work, to enter rural communities and to relate positively and effectively with rural people. The review team commends the proposals to orient faculty in preparation for work in rural communities.

6. The review team sought comments in each sub-region with respect to the Regional Coordinating Committee. The non-hierarchal operations of the committee, the autonomy given to the sub-regional committees, is liked. The regional committee is seen as facilitating information exchange among the sub-regions. A new and more lively role is seen for the regional committee as represented by the Railroad Abandonment Task Force project. Some concern was expressed as to the extent to which the most active members are university-college related and academically oriented but it was also felt that the regional committee performs a brokerage function which a single educational institution could not do and that state or federal agency dominance would not be desirable. Some envision an enlarged role for the regional committee with respect to proposals and plans by federal or state agencies to initiate programs within the region, i.e. the committee might serve as an information broker, as a kind of mediator.

It is suggested that the regional committee consider more feedback as to its meetings and activities to the members of the sub-regional committees and that it consider facilitating increased information exchange among the sub-regions.

7. A review is suggested of the criteria and the procedures for becoming a partner in PRI, especially at the sub-regional level, and of the roles and responsibilities of membership. This suggestion recognizes the need to strike a balance between (a) minimizing ambiguities, confusion, and possible conflict by formalizing procedures, objectives, roles, and responsibilities and (b) maintaining flexibility so as to retain the nature of PRI as a continually emerging reality.

8. The suggestion is offered that a systematic monitoring in appropriate ways be considered with respect to PRI activities and the situations in which PRI works to detect and diagnose emerging difficulties, e.g. barriers to effective work by program associates in the sub-regions, delays in completion of tasks promised for specific deadlines, and potential conflicts.

9. It is suggested that consideration be given to a systematic, periodic needs assessment in the region with provision built in for recognizing important within-region variations.

10. Suggested is an attempt to develop and maintain for use of the partners an updated inventory of the resources available within the total set of potential providers--educational institutions and the public and private agencies. It is recognized that a good start on this has been made at WSU and EWU.

11. Finally, in relation to the need to document the PRI experience in order to maximize the lessons learned from it, the suggestion is made that provision be made for the PRI staff who have been most fully involved for quite a long period (in the sub-regions, at EWU, and at WSU) to have some time set aside to reflect on the experience and to contribute to establishing

a record of the lessons learned. These key staff members have had a work schedule which has placed heavy demands on their time and energy. The work load has been increasing a great deal.

What is missing at present, to paraphrase one concerned staff member, is time to reflect on the processes and the products. It is apparent that the lessons learned from the PRI experience are much more clearly identified in the minds of those most actively involved than was the case a year ago. These lessons should not be lost.

VIII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The suggestions for consideration are offered in an attempt to be analytical and constructive. Rural communities have unique problems associated with small scale, low population density, and problems of access to resources essential for problem-solving. They are especially at a disadvantage in coping with the impact of change brought by external and impersonal economic, technological, and social forces. Population growth and new economic and technological developments have major implications for many of the small communities on the 11-county area within which PRI is now operating.

The Partnership for Rural Improvement is rural-oriented. It has succeeded in putting in place and testing a structure and a process designed to operate on a continuing basis to link rural communities and the resources which are or should be available to assist rural communities. All the answers are not yet in. It is evident, however, that agencies and institutions are now working together which had not previously had collaborative relationships or are working together in new ways. It is evident that, as a result of the structure and process and the supporting staff, a growing number of citizens and elected and appointed officials in rural areas have increased their competency to cope

with community problems and that there are tangible project outcomes. It is evident that within the institutions of higher education there is increased commitment, heightened interest, and the start of new support arrangements with respect to having the knowledge and research resources of those institutions better serve rural community needs.

The capacity of PRI to assist on the full range of problems faced by rural communities has not yet been tested. An unparalleled opportunity for such testing is now emerging in the eleven county area. Massive new investments--power plants, mines, oil pipe lines--are about to be initiated. PRI is in place in the area, and is capable, potentially, of bringing together citizens, local governments, local planning and development bodies, local public service agencies and state and federal agencies to deal with the developments and their effects. Involvement in such a task would test existing and develop new collaborative mechanisms. This is what PRI has been doing. It seems to be ready now for such a challenging engagement. We would encourage PRI to take the initiative, and to become involved in a major way.

The transfer of PRI to new areas remains to be tested, also. There are many valuable lessons in the PRI experience which have been recorded. Many more need to be recorded. Such recording helps build a body of knowledge about collaborative problem solving, and is a continuing necessity to help define and describe the PRI model. Such a model is always emerging and changing as it responds to new tasks in a given area, and as it is transferred to new areas. The successes to-date are convincing. A solid basis exists on which to build.

APPENDIX A

Persons Interviewed During External Review of Partnership for Rural Improvement February 23 - March 5, 1980

WESTERN SUB-REGION

PRI Staff

Sally A. Bartrum, Program Associate
Carol Oakes, Program Assistant

Wenatchee Valley College

James Davis, President
John Aylmer, Coordinator of Armchair Campus
Marlene Curtis, Coordinator Community Resource Center, member of Western Sub-Region Committee
Ed Hill, Associate Dean for Special Programs, Chairman of Western Sub-Region Committee, member and past chairman of PRI Regional Coordinating Committee
Bill Martin, Media Specialist-Director of Learning Technology
Nancy Stetson, Information and Development Officer
Wini Voelckers, Director Okanogan Education Center, Omak and member of Western Sub-Region Committee

Sub-Region Committee Members

Hazel Burnett, Director, Okanogan County Community Action Program
Ernie Forge, Assistant Superintendent, Educational Service Dist. 171
Dan Walters, Adult Services Coordinator, North Central Regional Library
(Marlene Curtis, Ed Hill, and Wini Voelckers, WVC, also interviewed as members of Western Sub-Region Committee)

Program Participants

Margo Hornback, Director Wenatchee Rape Crisis Center and Chelan-Douglas Domestic Violence Project
Margie Jones, Instructor-Coordinator High School Completion
Judd Lockwood, Manager, Omak Chamber of Commerce
Margaret Moran, Central Washington Hospital (submitted letter)
Wayne Satchwell, Coordinator of Community Involvement Program (WVC), Coordinator of Education and Training for the Area Agency on Aging

CENTRAL SUB-REGION

PRI Staff

William Thompson, Program Assistant

Big Bend Community College

Peter D. DeVries, President
Fred Huston, Dean, Occupation Education, Chairman of Central Sub-Region Committee, and member of Regional Coordinating Committee

Sub-Region Committee Members

Julian Agranoff, Executive Director, Council of Governments (Grant, Adams, and Lincoln Counties)
Noel A. Brown, Director, RSVP, Grant County Community Action Council
Douglas Miller, citizen
Lee Perdue, Mayor, Royal City
Diane A. Slate, Grant County Community Action Council
Kenneth Waud, Chairman, Grant County Cooperative Extension
(Fred Huston, Big Bend Community College, also interviewed as a member of Central Sub-Region Committee)

Program Participants

Dwight DuVall, President, Custom Cannery Board, Royal Slope
Lee Perdue, Mayor, Royal City
Lolena Schambaugh, Citizens Planning Group, Grand Coulee

EASTERN SUB-REGION

PRI Staff

Vicki Braglio-Luther, Program Associate
Gregory P. Spencer, formerly Program Assistant

Sub-Region Committee Members

Dick Bloom, Grants Manager, Educational Service Dist. 101
Marie Bremner, Chairperson, Ferry County Cooperative Extension
Margaret Clow, Librarian, Whitman County Library
Carolyn Hyde, Member of Almira City Council
Gene Rieger, Director of Continuing Education/Extension, Washington State Community College District 17, Chairman of Eastern Sub-Region Committee, past member of PRI Regional Coordinating Committee
Mary Selecky, Administrator, Tri-County Health District, member of PRI Regional Coordinating Committee

Program Participants

Mary Adams, Spokane Symphony Staff
Abby Byrne, former Spokane County Planning Commissioner
Bonnie Caugherty, TRICO Economic Development Agency, Colville
O. J. Coates, Project Director, Kalispel History Project
Randy Crewse, Chairperson, Rockford Planning Commission
Bruce Davis, Area Agent, Cooperative Extension, (Adams County in Central and Lincoln County in Eastern Sub-Region)

Dan Kelley, Environmental Health Specialist, Pend Oreille County
Shirley A. Michaelson, District Coordinator of Women's Programs, Washington State Community College District 17 (submitted letter)
Bruce Pennell, Executive Director, Northeast Washington Rural Resources Development Corporation
Don Thulean, Spokane Symphony
Sonny Tuttle, Natural Resources Director, Kalispel Indian Tribe
Brenda VonBrach, Career Planning Office, Women's Help Line, Washington State Community College District 17
Mary Yann, Member of Friends of the Library, Pend Oreille County

EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, Cheney

Administration

H. George Frederickson, President
William Hoekendorf, Dean of College of Letters and Sciences, member of PRI Regional Coordinating Committee
Don Horner, Director of Continuing Education
Gordon Martinen, Vice-President, Extended Programs
Katherine Sherman, Provost Academic Affairs
Niel Zimmerman, Dean of School of Public Affairs

Faculty

William G. Goetter, PRI Program Associate; Associate Professor, Department of Education; Director, Community Service Center
Douglas Gwynn, Chairman of Department of Sociology
Fred Hurand, Assistant Professor, Department of Urban and Regional Planning; part-time Community Service Center
William Kelley, Assistant Professor, Department of Urban and Regional Planning; part-time Community Service Center
Joseph N. Luther, formerly PRI Program Associate; Chairman of Department of Urban and Regional Planning

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY, Pullman

PRI Staff

Richard A. Hagood, PRI Program Administrator
Robert N. Grunewald, Professor of Education
William R. Lassey, Professor of Rural Sociology
Ralph Loomis, Cooperative Extension Economist, Title V Rural Development Project Leader
Harvey Low, Professor of Education
Robert H. McDaniel, PRI Research Associate; Research Associate for Railroad Abandonment Task Force
C. Gordon Morris, PRI Program Associate; Coordinator of Railroad Abandonment Task Force
Dwight Pace, Area Agent, Cooperative Extension

University and College Administration

Glenn Terrell, President
John Slaughter, Academic Vice-President and Provost
George Brain, Dean, College of Education
Constance Kravas, Office of University Development; member of Continuing Education Task Force
Jack S. Robins, Dean, College of Agriculture; Chairman of PRI-WSU Administrative Council
M. G. Kallaher, Associate Dean, Division of Sciences
J. Orville Young, Director, Cooperative Extension

Other Administration and Faculty

Donald Dillman, Chairman, Department of Rural Sociology; Chairman of Regional Coordinating Committee
Gary L. Poor, District Supervisor, Cooperative Extension
Leroy Rogers, Chairman, Department of Agricultural Economics
James Barron, State Leader, Community Resource Development, Cooperative Extension
Donald Pelton, Professor of Business Administration; member of Continuing Education Task Force
Robert E. Howell, Extension Rural Sociologist
Bruce Florea, Extension Economist
Geraldine Plater, District Supervisor, Cooperative Extension
Kenneth D. Duft, Extension Economist
Ronald C. Faas, Extension Economist
Lester Liebel, Rural Development Coordinator, Cooperative Extension
Ray Young, Professor of Education

APPENDIX B

Detailed Schedule
Partnership for Rural Improvement External Review
February 23 - March 5, 1980

	Dr. Moe	Dr. Larson	Dr. Madden
SAT. 2/23/80 SPOKANE	Met by William R. Lassey, PRI Program Associate for Evaluation. External Review Planning and Preparation		
SUN. 2/24/80 SPOKANE	Travel from Spokane to Wenatchee with Richard A. Hagood, PRI Program Administrator. Orientation given by Hagood.		
MON. 2/25/80 WENATCHEE			
9:00-12:00	Met with Hagood for Orientation/Discussion/Clarification of Review and with Western Sub-Region staff members Salley A. Bartrum and Carol Oakes for orientation regarding PRI in the sub-region. LOCATION: Thunderbird Motor Inn, Wenatchee.		
12:00-2:00	Wenatchee Valley College Administration and Staff Jim Davis, Ed Hill, Wini Voelckers, Nancy Stetson, Bill Martin, John Aylmer, Marlene Curtis	USER-Judd Lockwood, Omak, Telephone interview	Jim Davis, President of WVC, met separately with Larson and Madden for part of the time.
3:00-5:00	USERS-Margo Hornback, Margie Jones, Wayne Satchwell	PARTNERS-Ernie Forge, Hazel Burnett, Dan Walters, Ed Hill (Chairman, Western Sub-Region Committee), Wini Voelckers	Same as Larson
	NOTE: Letter submitted by Margaret Moran, USER.		

	Dr. Moe	Dr. Larson	Dr. Madden
TUES. 2/26/80 WENATCHEE	Breakfast with Sally A. Bartrum and Carol Oakes, PRI staff, Western Sub-Region.		
11:00 MOSES LAKE	Arrive in Moses Lake.		
11:30-12:15	Met with Central Sub-Region PRI staff member Bill Thompson, with Hagood and WSU PRI staff Ralph Loomis, Dwight Pace, and Rob McDaniel for Orientation/ Discussion/Review of PRI in the Central Sub-Region.		
12:15-1:45	Lunch with Fred Huston, Big Bend Community College and Chairman of Central Sub-Region Committee.		
1:45-2:45	Peter DeVries, President, Big Bend Community College		USERS-Dwight Duvall, Lee Perdue, Lolena Schambaugh
3:00-4:30	Met with Central Sub-Region Committee; attending were Fred Huston, Julian Agranoff, Noel Brown, Bruce Davis, Douglas Miller, Lee Perdue, Lolena Schambaugh, Diane Slate, Kenneth Waud and PRI staff.		
4:30	Travel to Spokane		
WED. 2/27/80 CHENEY 9:00-10:30	Eastern Washington University faculty with PRI involvement: Joe Luther, Bill Kelley, Fred Hurand, Bill Goetter, Bill Hoekendorf; also Greg Spencer		USERS-Randy Crewse, Abby Byrne, Don Thulean
10:30-12:00	Eastern Wasington University administration and staff--George Fredrickson, Katherine Sherman, Gordon Martinen, Bill Hoekendorf, Joe Luther, Bill Goetter, Don Horner, Niel Zimmerman, Douglas Gwynn.		
SPOKANE 1:00-2:00	Vicki Braglio-Luther, PRI staff, Eastern Sub-Region		
2:00-2:30	USER-Brenda VonBrach	USER-Mary Yann	USER-Brenda VonBrach
2:30-4:00	Eastern Sub-Region Committee members Dick Bloom, Marie Bremner, Margaret Clow, and Mary Selecky.		
4:00-4:30	USER-Bruce Pennell	USER-Dan Kelley	
	NOTE: Letter submitted by Shirley A. Michaelson, USER.		

	Dr. Moe	Dr. Larson	Dr. Madden
THURS. 2/28/80 SPOKANE			
8:30-10:00	Vicki Braglio-Luther, Greg Spencer, Dwight Pace		
10:00-10:30	Bruce Davis, Cooperative Extension Area Agent		
10:30-11:00			USER and member of Sub-Region Committee--Carol Hyde
11:00-12:00		USERS-O.J. Coates, Sonny Tuttle	USERS-Maxy Adams, Bonnie Caugherty
12:00	Gene Rieger, Chairman, Eastern Sub-Region Committee		
1:00	Travel to Pullman		
PULLMAN 3:00-5:00	Sociology Department Seminar	PRI Staff--Richard Hagood, Robert Grunewald, Ralph Loomis, Harvey Low, Gordon Morris, Dwight Pace, Rob McDaniel; also Ray Young	
FRI. 2/29/80 PULLMAN			
9:00-10:00	WSU President Glenn Terrell, and Provost John Slaughter		
10:00-11:00	WSU Administrators--George Brain, John S. Robins, M. G. Kallaher, Orville Young		
11:00-12:00	Other WSU Administrators and Faculty--Don Dillman, Gary Poor, Leroy Rogers, Jim Barron		
12:00-1:30	Lunch with Don Dillman, John S. Robins, and Orville Young		
1:30-2:00	Geraldine Plater, Cooperative Extension District Supervisor	Bruce Florea, Extension Economist, WSU (NOTE: submitted prepared statement)	
2:00-2:30	Don Pelton, Continuing Education Task Force		
2:30-3:00		Ken Duft, Extension Economist, WSU	
3:00-4:00	Les Liebel, Rural Development Coordinator, Cooperative Extension		

	Dr. Moe	Dr. Larson	Dr. Madden
FRI. 2/29/80 Continued			
4:00	Review team work session		
SAT. 3/1/80 PULLMAN			
9:00-5:00	Leave Spokane for Washington, D.C.	Review team work session.	
SUN. 3/2/80 PULLMAN			
9:00-5:00		Review team work session.	
MON. 3/3/80 PULLMAN			
9:00-10:00		Review team work session.	
10:00-11:00		Bob Howell, Extension Rural Sociologist, WSU	
11:00-11:45		Ron Faas, Extension Economist, WSU	
11:45-12:00		Constance Kravas, Office of University Development, WSU	
12:00-1:30		Lunch with PRI staff members Hagood, Lassey, Morris, and McDaniel	
1:30-5:00		Review team work session.	
TUES. 3/4/80 PULLMAN			
9:00-5:00		Review team work session.	
WED. 3/5/80 PULLMAN			
9:00-3:15		Participation in PRI Forum	
3:15-4:15		Report to Forum on Results of external review	

	Dr. Moe	Dr. Larson	Dr. Madden
WED. 3/5/80 Continued			
4:15-5:00		Participation in PRI Forum	
6:00-10:00		PRI Forum Banquet	
10:00		Travel to Spokane	
THURS. 3/6/80 SPOKANE			
8:00		Leave Spokane Airport for home.	